

ALAN WATT BLURB
"MONEY, MASTERS AND CON-SCIENCE"
February 9, 2007

Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - February 9, 2007
(Exempting Music and Literary Quotes)

WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Hello. I'm Alan Watt and today is February 9th, 2007.

I thought I'd close off this week by reading a few pages from a very good book written by an insider, **Lord Bertrand Russell**. This book was called "***The Impact of Science on Society***" and I'll preface this with a little talk on Russell himself.

He was a member of hereditary aristocracy who seemed to have been picked for his abilities in mathematics and certain sciences to help formulate his part in this agenda of a futuristic society that was to come into place, in which he worked tirelessly his whole life towards. This is the man who talked about the necessity for getting rid of the "***useless eaters***" as he called them.

The "***useless eaters***" would be those who had no purpose in serving the economic system and the upcoming new economic system more especially. He had no problems with debating eugenics, which is all part of this new system coming into play, and he talked candidly about the effects on the world in general. Russell seems to have been commissioned for his role in life and picked out at university, although there are letters left in his family that when he was a child superiors in the British government had set a role for him when he was only four or five years of age, a hereditary type role.

His family had always taken part in policy making for Britain, being members of this aristocracy. I'll read on **page 36** of "***The Impact of Science on Society***".

"She Blinded Me With Science"
By Thomas Dolby

It's poetry in motion
She turned her tender eyes to me
As deep as any ocean
As sweet as any harmony
Mmm - but she blinded me with science
"She blinded me with science!"
And failed me in biology

When I'm dancing close to her
"Blinding me with science - science!"
I can smell the chemicals
"Blinding me with science - science!"
"Science!"

"Science!"

"War has been, throughout history, the chief source of social cohesion; and since science began, it has been the strongest incentive to technical progress. Large groups have a better chance of victory than small ones, and therefore the usual result of war is to make States larger. In any given state of technique there's a limit to size. The Roman Empire was stopped by German forests and African deserts; the British conquests in India were halted by the Himalayas; Napoleon was defeated by the Russian winter. And before the telegraph large empires tended to break up because they could not be effectively controlled from a center. Communications have been hitherto the chief factor limiting the size of empires."

In antiquity, the Persians and the Romans depended upon roads, but since nothing traveled faster than a horse empires became unmanageable when the distance from the capital to the frontier was very great. This difficulty was diminished by railways and the telegraph and is in the point of disappearing with the improvement of the long-range bomber. There would now be no technical difficulty but a single worldwide Empire. Since war is likely to become more destructive of human life than it has been in recent centuries, unification under a single government is probably necessary unless we are to acquiesce in either a return to barbarism or the extinction of the human race."

The one thing he omits here and you'll find this as they lead you towards a mode of thinking where you think, "well he's right there, yeah he's reasonable there and yeah that's understandable. That makes sense. It makes sense." He's using a form of logic and remember that Bertrand Russell was into the philosophies and he was a philosopher as well as a mathematician and he understood rhetoric, the ability of speaking and formulating, to do this very thing, to guide you into a mode of thinking where you can identify with the first half a dozen or ten or twelve topics he brings up and his solutions to them. Then once you've swallowed that, he's guiding you into other areas and you're not on guard anymore. He's taking you along a way of thinking which you will agree to. This is actually an exercise in logic you might say. They taught this in ancient Greece and Rome.

"There is, it must be confessed, a psychological difficulty about a single world government. The chief source of social cohesion in the past, I repeat, has been war: the passions that inspire a feeling of unity are hate and fear."

Now remember, he's talking about empire building. He doesn't mention that the system that he belonged to happened to be behind the wars. The aristocracy mixed with the bankers. Business bankers, aristocracy. The ordinary people don't cause wars. It doesn't happen. They don't have the finances to start wars and it's the last thing on their mind is going off across the sea to kill people when they've got a wife and family at home. At least they used to anyway. So he's already admitted the major cause of wars. It's not just the people being annoyed and upset about something. It's getting the people upset and annoyed so they'll join the militaries and are taken off to fight for an agenda which they really never understand. They think they understand. He says:

"These depend upon the existence of an enemy, actual or potential. It seems to follow that a world government could only be kept in being by force, not

by the spontaneous loyalty that now inspires a nation at war."

During war, all the patriotic symbols and the tribal symbols are pulled and out and waved and brass bands go and speeches are made and tears fill the eyes and all this kind of stuff to get us emotionally involved. That's emotive involvement. However, as he said - now he should know this because he attended the big meetings with the Royal Institute of International Affairs and all the other British Empire organizations that ran the world right up until his time. He was born at the tail end of the predominant British rule, a British Empire, and this book I think was published around 1952 I think it was, first published and it was taken from writings from speeches he'd given at different universities. Dean Rusk, remember, the guy who inspired Cecil Rhodes, the college in Oxford and at Columbia University New York and the last few chapters were at Lloyd Roberts lecture given at the Royal Society of Medicine in London in 1949 because he was involved in eugenics and population reduction.

The book is geared and written in such a way to build up to different things and he has things at the beginning which you can identify with, believe and understand. The rest of it is to try and guide your thoughts to support this agenda. And he's already admitted that:

"It would seem to follow that a world government could only be kept in being by force."

They couldn't use the old techniques of having an enemy to fight because it would be an unseen enemy. The enemy of course we've found now is terrorism, which is everywhere. It could be you. It could be yourself and you don't know it yet. You need a psychologist to do a test on you and they'll find out, or maybe measure your skull or the lobes of your ear. To continue:

"So far, I have been considering only techniques derived from physics and chemistry. These have, up to the present, been the most important, but biology, physiology, and psychology are likely in the long run to affect human life quite as much as physics and chemistry."

Then he goes into the next kicker.

"Take first the question of food and population. At present the population of the globe is increasing at the rate of about 20 millions a year."

I love these statistics. There are lies, damn lies and then there are statistics; but if it's scientific it must be true.

"Most of this increase is in Russia and Southeast Asia. The population of Western Europe and the United States is nearly stationary. Meanwhile, the food supply of the world as a whole threatens to diminish, as a result of unwise methods of cultivation and destruction of forests. This is an explosive situation. Left to itself, it must lead to a food shortage and thence to a world war. Technique, however, makes other issues possible."

Vital statistics in the West are dominated by medicine and birth control: the one diminishes the deaths, the other the births. The result is that the average

age in the West increases: There is a smaller percentage of young people and a larger percentage of old people. The danger of a world shortage of food may be averted for a time by improvements in the technique of agriculture. But, if population continues to increase at the present rate, such improvements cannot long suffice. There will then be two groups, one poor with increasing population, the other rich with a stationary population. Such a situation can hardly fail to lead to world war."

He keeps telling you this over and over. You see, he's making a conclusion for you without telling you, well, it was himself, the bankers, and the class he belonged to that made the wars in the past.

"If there is not to be an endless succession of wars, population will have to become stationary throughout the world, and this will probably have to be done, in many countries as a result of governmental measures."

Making the laws of sterilization is what he's talking about here. He says:

"This will require an extension of scientific technique into very intimate matters."

He goes on to say:

"There are, however, two other possibilities. War may become so destructive that, at any rate for a time, there is no danger of overpopulation; or the scientific nations may be defeated and anarchy may destroy scientific technique. Biology is likely to affect human life through the study of heredity."

They're talking about genetics there to see if you have or you're prone to diseases or to pass them on genetically, born diseases.

"Without science, men have changed domestic animals and food plants enormously in advantageous ways. It may be assumed that they will change them much more, and much more quickly, by bringing the science of genetics to bear."

Now they knew - this is in the 1950's he's giving these talks, these lectures, a member of the largest social control organizations of the British Empire. He knew the agendas. He was part of the agendas and he will couch things in such a way it doesn't sound so terrible.

"Perhaps, even, it may become possible artificially to induce desirable mutations in genes. (Hitherto the only mutations that can be artificially caused are neutral or harmful.) In any case, it is pretty certain that scientific technique will very soon effect great improvements in the animals and plants that are use to man."

If you go back to Rutherford in 1920's, the great mathematician, he was employed with an organization working on genetics before supposedly they discovered them, but that was in his own book. What Russell's telling you is partial truth. They'd already found ways to mutate genes in the desirable direction, as he would say, but he mustn't let the public know that at that time.

What they're talking about too, is if you weren't quite up to a standard, because obviously if they're talking about what's desirable and undesirable there must be standards set for what is desirable for IQ and different things. Therefore, they would enhance the person, the fetus. They would remove the ones they would call "defective" and put in the ones which would be more "effective," harking back to Plato's *Republic* of breeding humans for specific tasks. Well here we go again. These guys all were tremendous fans and advocates of Plato because this is a very, very old society that runs the world.

"When such methods of modifying the congenital character of animals and plants have been pursued long enough to make their success obvious, it is probable that there will be a powerful movement for applying scientific methods to human propagation. There would at first be strong religious and emotional obstacles to the adoption of such a policy. But suppose (say) Russia were able to overcome these obstacles and to breed a race stronger, more intelligent, and more resistant to disease than any race of men that has hitherto existed, and suppose the other nations perceived that unless they followed suit they would be defeated in war, then either the other nations would voluntarily forgo their prejudices, or, after defeat, they would be compelled to forgo them. Any scientific technique, however beastly, is bound to spread if it is useful in war"

See, what he's doing is telling you what had been discussed; all these different possibilities had been discussed over and over at higher level meetings. How could he get the general populations of the world to go along with this? and they could cause wars and do exactly as he suggested. It's odd that the same people who apparently went all out to defeat Hitler and his eugenics programs seemed to be identical in their nature and their agenda to Hitler, isn't it? Isn't that an interesting little connection?

"Any scientific technique, however beastly, is bound to spread if it is useful in war until such time as men decide that they have had enough of war and will henceforth live in peace."

In other words, they can bring you to your knees, make you war weary. That was another thought that they had.

"As that day does not seem to be at hand, scientific breeding of human beings must be expected to come about. I shall return to this subject in a later chapter. Physiology and psychology afford fields for scientific technique which still await development. Two great men"

Great men, yeah.

"Pavlov and Freud"

I call it "fraud".

"have laid the foundation. I do not accept the view that they are in any essential conflict, but what structure will be built on their foundations is still in doubt."

We always hear about Pavlov experimenting with his awful experiments on dogs,

but what people don't know is that Pavlovian technique was also used by Pavlov on humans. What they found and what they learned was introduced into the schooling system in Russia to get the students to be more pliable, quieter, well behaved and not to ask questions, simply to repeat. Much more effectively than they did in Britain with their straps and canes to beat the children.

H.G. Wells, by the way, left his own son in the care of Pavlov to be trained by Pavlov, who was his hero, and his son became eventually a professor in zoology, I believe, using it for the study of animals and man. The same purposes as his dad and he went over to New York to work at a university. They're all connected these characters.

"I think the subject which will be of most importance politically is mass psychology."

This is a very important field here.

"Mass psychology is, scientifically speaking, not a very advanced study"

That's a complete lie even then.

"and so far its professors have not been in universities: they have been advertisers, politicians, and, above all, dictators. This study is immensely useful to practical men, whether they wish to become rich or to acquire the government. It is, of course, as a science, founded upon individual psychology, but hitherto it has employed rule-of-thumb methods which were based upon a kind of intuitive common sense. Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. Of these the most influential is what is called "education."

Education you see is propaganda.

"Religion plays a part, though a diminishing one; the press, the cinema, and the radio play an increasing part. What is essential in mass psychology is the art of persuasion. If you compare a speech of Hitler's with a speech of (say) Edmund Burke, you will see what strides have been made in the art since the eighteenth century. What went wrong formerly was that people had read in books that man is a rational animal, and framed their arguments on this hypothesis. We now know that limelight and a brass band do more to persuade than can be done by the most elegant train of syllogisms."

And it's true. You can see this being used in the United States with the big ticker tape parades of the welcoming heroes. Something that's to drum up the emotions to such a high pitch they'd never forget the sights. It's imprinted on their memory. We'll see the same thing used by presidents when they want wars to continue, where they'll bring in guests supposedly at State of the Union speeches, guests being the bereaved parents of men that died fighting for something or other, and they'll bring these parents to stand up in front of the cameras and everybody's turned to them and there's the mom crying. There's the dad with his lip trembling but looking stern and masculine and stiff upper lip and all that stuff. These techniques are used to the maximum by those who know how to manipulate opinion in the general public – the art of persuasion. He goes on to say:

"What went wrong formerly was that people had read in books that man is a rational animal, and framed their arguments on this hypothesis."

Then he goes on to say, to reiterate. He says:

"You can do more with a brass band and limelight, et cetera et cetera. It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment."

I'll read that part again.

"It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment."

When you think about how many children are taken from their parents now by Children's Aid because of the standardization, once more of what's supposed to be normal and abnormal within society. If parents are bringing up their children in an old-fashion way which doesn't fit in with the authorized new, then the children are simply taken off and taken away so that they don't get a religious indoctrination. They get a government indoctrination. One for the other. See, the old system was useful for the same controllers and their families because that was their predecessors. They're all hereditary, the controllers. They used religion for long enough, now it was time to move into the next step, the white coat replaces the black coat or the priests. He says:

"This subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship."

That's right out of Aldous Huxley, great friend again of Russell. They were all buddies because they all worked for the same organizations and went to the same meetings.

"Anaxagoras maintained that snow is black, but no one believed him. The social psychologists of the future will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black."

That reminds you right away of George Orwell's **"1984"** when he's being tortured by O'Brien and O'Brien says, "How many fingers am I holding up, Winston? Winston keeps telling him how many he sees and gets electric shocks, until he says, "it's as many as you want me to say."

"Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive."

Now this is what they called in Communism familiar or family familial infection. Old infection. Contamination is another term they used. Contamination of morals, contamination of antiquated ideals and the home itself because it used old ideals of the family, the rights of the family, the rights of the parents; the rights to pass

on morals was passing on "contaminated ideas." Remember that Bertrand Russell back in the 1920's, this same man here, was running experimental schools on behalf of the British government and authorized by the British Crown to test different kinds of ideals on children, mental tampering of all kinds, and everything in fact that happened in the 1960's he was allowed to practice on the youth in his schools in the 1920's. That's why they knew exactly what to expect. They observed the behavior.

"Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten."

In his earlier book, ***Education and the Good Life***, which came out of his experimental schools, he said that if we can get them at kindergarten and indoctrinate them even for two or three hours per day with a scientific indoctrination any input that the parents would try moral-wise or value-wise in the same day later on would be of no effect.

"Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective."

I'll repeat that bit because we all heard it. We all lived through it.

"Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective."

Listen to the music that came out in the 60's. Often you'd wonder did they run out of words or sentences or something or creativity. Maybe their pencil broke, because they would come to a line and just keep repeating it over and over and over and over. Well this was not by chance. This was part of the scientific indoctrinative methods being employed by intention and put out there by producers who told the groups what to do and rearranged their music for them.

"Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity."

You make people feel odd-ball if they said what they thought, which if they actually said, "well, I can't see that you know." So you make it a class thing, a group thing, where the group, who can be crazy and psychotic, if they all agree that things are the same according to their own perceptions, then they must all be sane. If you're the one who says, "no it's not, the snow is white," then they'll make you feel like you are mad. He says:

"But I anticipate. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark gray."

He's talking about every variation of the same theme must be totally investigated for maximum effect - cost-effective indoctrination.

*"Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. **The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated.**"*

Let's say that little bit again.

"Although this science will be diligently studied"

You see and there's thousands take psychology courses and so on, but it's really what they're getting are the crumbs. They're not getting the real higher meat. That's kept for a select few.

"it will be rigidly confined to the governing class."

There is a governing class. **Huxley** called it "***the dominant minority***." He calls it "*the governing class*." He's not talking about elected government either, by the way.

"The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated."

They will think it's their own idea, their own opinions.

"When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise."

At that time he was talking about, it was a toss up between the Soviet system and China, "the politician's paradise."

*"The social effects of scientific technique have already been many and important, and are likely to be even more noteworthy in the future. Some of these effects depend upon the political and economic character of the country concerned; others are inevitable, whatever this character may be. I propose in this chapter to consider only the inevitable effects. The most obvious and inescapable effect of scientific technique is that it makes society more organic, in the sense of increasing the **interdependence**"*

Interdependence, Margaret Thatcher's favorite word.

"interdependence of its various parts."

And you think it's not connected. It's all connected.

"In the sphere of production, this has two forms. There is first the very intimate interconnection of individuals engaged in a common enterprise, e.g. in a single factory; and secondly there is the relation, less intimate but still essential between one enterprise and another. Each of these becomes more important with every advance in scientific technique."

I'll continue on page 42.

"Although the peasant's lot is in any case a hard one, it is apt to be rendered harder by one or both of two enemies: the moneylender and the landowner."

Now they can tell a truth once in a while, and since he was basically an aristocrat whose family owned tenant farmers, he should be the landowner, I guess.

"In any history of any period, you will find roughly the following gloomy picture: "At this time the old hardy yeoman stock had fallen upon evil days. Under threat of starvation from bad harvests, many of them had borrowed from urban landowners, who had none of their traditions"

Totally different class.

"their ancient piety, or their patient courage. Those who had taken this fatal step became, almost inevitably, the slaves or serfs of members of the new commercial class. And so the sturdy farmers, who had been the backbone of the nation, were submerged by supple men who had the skill to amass new wealth by dubious methods."

That's called being successful actually.

"You will find substantially this account in the history of Attica before Solon, of Latium after the Punic Wars, of England in the early nineteenth century of Southern California as depicted in Norris' Octopus, of India under the British Raj, and of the reasons which have led Chinese peasants to support communism."

And it's quite funny because Bertrand Russell was also sent over to help initiate communism in China. He wrote about that in his memoirs. He taught at universities and he was basically teaching elementary communism while working for the British Crown.

"By way of contrast with the primitive peasant, consider the agrarian interests in modern California or Canada or Australia or the Argentine. Everything is produced for export, and the prosperity to be brought by exporting depends upon such distant matters as war in Europe or Marshall Aid or the devaluation of the pound. Everything turns on politics, on whether the Farm Bloc is strong in Washington, whether there is reason to fear that Argentina may make friends with Russia, and so on. There may still be nominally independent farmers, but in fact they are in the power of the vast financial interests that are concerned in manipulating political issues. This interdependence is in no degree lessened—perhaps it is even increased—if the countries concerned are socialist, as, for example, if the Soviet Government and the British Government make a deal to exchange food for machinery. All this is the effect of scientific technique in agriculture."

Now he goes on to talk about Malthus, one of his heroes.

"Malthus, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, wrote: "In the wildness of speculation it has been suggested that Europe should grow its corn in America, and devote itself solely to manufactures and commerce."

And they did for a while.

"It turned out that the speculation was by no means "wild." So much for

agriculture. In industry, the integration brought about by scientific technique is much greater and more intimate."

Now here's an important part here.

"One of the most obvious results of industrialism is that a much larger percentage of the population live in towns than was formerly the case. The town dweller is a more social being than the agriculturist, and is much more influenced by discussion."

In other words, the ones who live in the rural areas are more independent.

"In general, he works in a crowd"

That's a townsman.

"and his amusements are apt to take him into still larger crowds. The course of nature, the alternations of day and night, summer and winter, wet or shine, make little difference to him; he has no occasion to fear that he will be ruined by frost or drought or sudden rain. What matters to him is his human environment, and his place in various organizations especially."

The mass man really. The townsman.

"Take a man who works in a factory, and consider how many organizations affect his life. There is first of all the factory itself, and any larger organization of which it may be a part. Then there is the man's trade union and his political party. He probably gets house room from a building society or public authority. His children go to school. He reads a newspaper or goes to a cinema or looks at a football match, these things are provided by powerful organizations."

There's nothing in life that's spontaneous and there for your amusement or entertainment.

"Indirectly, through his employers, he is dependent upon those from whom they buy their raw material and those to whom they sell their finished product. Above all, there is the State, which taxes him and may at any moment order him to go and get killed in war, in return for which it protects him against murder and theft so long as there is peace, and allows him to buy a fixed modicum of food."

He goes on, on page 45, to say:

"The increase of organization has brought into existence new positions of power. Every body has to have executive officials, in whom, at any moment, its power is concentrated. It is true that officials are usually subject to control, but the control may be slow and distant. From the young lady who sells stamps in a post office all the way up to the Prime Minister, every official is invested, for the time being, with some part of the power of the State."

And by God they let you know it, don't they? You really do get to know it. They don't really call themselves public servants at all or anymore. And they keep you waiting and they look down their noses at you because you're common. You don't

work for the government. He says:

"You can complain of the young lady if her manners are bad, and you can vote against the Prime Minister at the next election if you disapprove of his policy. But both the young lady and the Prime Minister can have a very considerable run for their money before (if ever) your discontent has any effect."

Jobs for life.

"This increase in the power of officials is a constant source of irritation to everybody else. In most countries they are much less polite than in England; the police, especially in America for instance, seem to think you must be a rare exception if you are not a criminal. This tyranny of officials is one of the worst results of increasing organization, and one against which it is of the utmost importance to find safeguards if a scientific society is not to be intolerable to all but an insolent aristocracy of Jacks-in-office. But for the present I am concerned with description, not with schemes of reform."

Now he'd also taken part in many discussions and debates within the Royal Institute of International Affairs and various scientific organizations on all of these topics. They knew they'd have to bring in massive, massive organization of officials and Lenin even talked about it, an age would come in the West where there'd be so many departments of government that they would be tripping over each other's toes as they interloped on each others territory, and that was the stage that would come just before the end of the old stage into the new. Bertrand Russell knew all this too, because, as I say, capitalism and communism all worked for the same side ultimately.

"The power of officials is, usually, distinct from that of people who are theoretically in ultimate control. In large corporations, although the directors are nominally elected by the shareholders, they usually manage, by various devices to be in fact self-perpetuating, and to acquire new directors, when necessary, by co-option more or less disguised as election. In British politics, it is a commonplace that most Ministers find it impossible to cope with their civil servants, who in effect dictate policy except on party questions that have been prominently before the public."

Now in other words and this is the important part, you see, it doesn't matter who you vote in. These guys belong to an organization all right. However, the civil servants, the bureaucrats who run the departments they are placed in charge of, are there for life. They know what it's all about. It was so comical to watch the game of musical chairs that happens in democratic countries when they re-shuffle their cabinets and so on, and Miss so-and-so that once the director of all health organizations for the country is now in charge of the environment or sewage systems or something like that. Of course they don't know anything about it, so of course they have to depend on the bureaucrats that no one elects to tell them what to do.

"In many countries the armed forces are apt to get out of hand and defy the civil authorities. Of the police I have already spoken, but concerning them there is more to be said. In countries where the communists enter coalition governments, they always endeavor to make sure of control of the police. When

once this is secured, they can manufacture plots"

Now where have we heard all that before?

"make arrests, and extort confessions freely."

Well we have it by law now under all these terrorist laws.

"By this means they pass from being participants in a coalition to being the whole government. The problem of causing the police to obey the law is a very difficult one."

There's your dialectic.

"It is for example, very far from being solved in America, where confessions are apt to be extorted by "third degree" from people who may well be innocent."

And he quotes from a book called "***Our Lawless Police***, by Ernest Jerome Hopkins, N.Y. Viking Press.

"The increased power of officials is an inevitable result of the greater degree of organization that scientific technique brings about. It has the drawback that it is apt to be irresponsible, behind-the-scenes, power, like that of emperors' eunuchs and kings' mistresses in former times."

Not tonight Josephine.

"To discover ways of controlling it is one of the most important political problems of our age. Liberals protested, successfully, against the power of kings and aristocrats; socialists protested against the power of capitalists. But unless the power of officials can be kept within bounds, socialism will mean little more than the substitution of one set of masters for another: all the former power of the capitalist will be inherited by the official."

Now a little bit from page 48.

"Owing to the increase of organization, the question of the limits of individual liberty needs completely different treatment from that of nineteenth century writers such as Mill. The acts of a single man are as a rule unimportant, but the acts of groups are more important than they used to be. Take, for example, refusal to work. If one man, on his own initiative, chooses to be idle, that may be regarded as his own affair; he loses his wages, and there is an end of the matter. But if there is a strike in a vital industry, the whole community suffers. I am not arguing that the right to strike should be abolished; I am only arguing that, if it is to be preserved, it must be for reasons concerned with this particular matter, and not on general grounds of personal liberty."

In a highly organized country there are many activities which are important to everybody, and without which there would be widespread hardship. Matters should be so arranged that large groups seldom think it to their interest to strike. This can be done by arbitration and conciliation, or, as under the

dictatorship of the proletariat, by starvation and police action. But in one way or another it must be done if an industrial society is to prosper."

This is a fellow who also knew that Britain in his day was already over the industrial era, because they'd signed an agreement with the United Nations to de-industrialize in 1945. It's quite interesting to see what they say to the public, what they infer and then to find what they really know. Since this was meant to get people onboard the pirate ship with this agenda and many people in ordinary life belong to the Bertrand Russell society. They believe in all this stuff and eugenics et cetera.

This character without any problems goes down the whole list of all the problems that he sees and his groups see, but it's all to do with population control, mind control, and as he already said it, "***the public would be unaware of how their minds were manipulated.***" That's probably the most important part because Zbigniew Brzezinski said the same thing in the "***Technetronic Era***".

"A technique would shortly be used on the public of which the public were completely unaware, which would be a form of mind control."

The "***Technetronic Era***" was to do with technology, science and electronics, EMP and all that stuff and HAARP technologies, so it's not hard to guess he was talking about literally using it on the public, which probably is in effect I really do believe it's being used now. It makes sense they would use this kind of technology on the public as they bring us through the greatest changes since the beginning or even pre-industrialization of countries like Britain. The massive flows of people from the country to the cities, by force often and coercion by others.

We're seeing the same things again as was turned upside down to fit an agenda, put out by people who worked for the same organization that ran the old system, the higher elite, aristocrats and the bankers all combined together. They're simply updating their system to make it more effective and cost-effective and less troublesome to manage, and we always go along with it because ***we think it's our system, just because we're born into it and it preexists we think it's natural.*** Exactly what Lenin and Stalin said.

People are kept worrying and scurrying through their whole lives. Most turn on the television to zonk out after work like a tranquilizer. Instant hypnosis where others program their minds for them, flush it clean of all the day's worry while downloading them with predictive programming. They seldom read books. They're too exhausted or neurotic or afraid. They have no patience to do it anymore and they're oblivious to this kind of topic I've been on about tonight. It can't be true because the major media isn't saying it. If the major media says it then they'll start thinking about it.

In fact, the major media will tell them whatever to think about, whether it's Michael Jackson or Dolly Parton's new pair of whatever, that becomes their topics of thought and conversation. **The media is an essential arm of government.** That's why it's media. **It's in the MIDDLE.** It passes down filtered stuff to the masses and gives you your thoughts for the masses. Yet unless we go through all the material that's been made available to those who want to find it, legally, that

is. It's been put out as a legalism. That's why it's there and available.

It's a completely different world we live in. It's a horror story and you'll find that when they discuss things they wish to do in the future, you'll always find when they announce it for the first time in a book that you can get your hands on, it's old stuff. They've been doing it for a long time. That's their double-speak. We'd like to blah, blah in the future. In reality, they've already done it. They've been doing it.

At some of the ivy league universities where these people go around and are given their honors and they're applauded by people as though they were some kind of rock stars, but they're applauded by the offspring of the hereditary elites who see themselves fitting into this dominant class system where they will be the ones who will escape the techniques that Russell talks about, where he says the dominant minority, the managerial bunch, won't be affected by the same form of mind control. They all see themselves as part of that. That's why they applaud. They have scraped by the finish line and got into the upper group.

Man's inhumanity to man knows no bounds and self-preservation is an ugly thing at times. I'll probably read more of this in the future and get to the parts about population reduction and the methods which he advocated. Once again, when he advocated this stuff it was already being done. In a sense, it's almost like testing the waters to see how we react to their books.

That's it for Bertrand Russell, or Lord Bertrand Russell, the chinless wonder, for tonight. As for me, I've got a lot to do this weekend. I'm sure you all have too. I'll try and catch up on the mailing and different things, but there's so much to look back on and get up-to-date with. However, it has to be done.

It's good night from me and Hamish, and may your god or gods or favorite authors or whatever go with you.

"Flying On Your Own" **By Rita MacNeil**

You were never more strong girl
You were never more alone
Once there was two, now there's
Just you
You're flying on your own

You were never more happy girl
You were never oh so blue
Once heartaches begin
Nobody wins
You're flying on your own

Chorus:
And when you know the wings you ride
Can keep you in the sky
There isn't anyone holding back you
First you stumble, then you fall
You reach out and you fly
There isn't anything that you can't do

You were never more wise girl
You were never more a fool
Once you break through
It's all up to you
You're flying on your own

You were never more together
You were never more apart
Once pieces of you were all that
You knew
You're flying on your own

Chorus
Repeat Chorus

(Transcribed by Linda)